

Remarks

This is a response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed January 20, 2010, and the Restriction Requirement mailed October 7, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below. In response to the restriction requirement mailed October 7, 2009, Applicant elects Species II with traverse (Figures 7-10). Claims 65, 70-83, and 86-88 correspond to Species II. Independent Claim 78 is a generic claim that corresponds to Species II and III. Applicant traverses the restriction requirement to the extent that Species II and III are not distinct and to the extent that Claims 78-79, 82, and 86-88 are not generic to both Species II and III.

Claims 65, 70-83, and 86-88 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, Applicant has withdrawn Claims 41-64 and 66-69; added new Claims 70-83 and 86-88; and withdrawn-new Claims 84-85. Of the pending Claims, Claims 65 and 78 are independent claims. Claims 70-77 depend from independent Claim 65 and Claims 79-88 depend from independent Claim 78.

Applicant has added independent Claim 78. Claim 78 recites projections having edges, which Applicant believes to be generic to both Species II and III. There would be no serious burden on the examiner to search and examine Species II and III together as Figures 7-12 because projections having edges as recited in Claim 78 may be either the tangs illustrated in Figures 7-10 (the Examiner identified Species II according to Figures 7-10), the cylindrical keys illustrated in Figures 11-12 (the Examiner identified Species III as according to Figures 11-12), or both the tangs and cylindrical keys. In addition to Claim 78, Applicant believes Claims 79, 82, and 86-88 to be generic to both Species II and III. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to combine Species II and III into a single species.

Applicant notes that Examiner searched in Class 188 and corresponding subclasses 234, 235, 250g, 250b, 250e, and 250d on February 12, 2009, for subject matter drawn to Claims 1-16 and 27-40, which were drawn to Species I, II, III, and IV. Applicant believes there would

Application Number: 10/595,350
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2009

Atty Dkt No. CMB 0101 PUSA

be no substantial additional burden on the examiner to search and examine withdrawn Claims 41-64 and 66-69 since Claims 41-64 and 66-69 relate to the same subject matter searched on February 12, 2009. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the restriction requirement.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this application is requested. If the Examiner notes any minor errors, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that the matter can be promptly handled by Examiner's amendment.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Beri

By/Mathew R. Syrowik/

Mathew R. Syrowik
Reg. No. 62,443
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 1, 2010

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351